DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 341 658 SP 033 543

AUTHOR Jivelekas, Pete; And Others
TITLE Intern/Student Teachers at the University of Tennessee College of Education as Perceived by Their Cooperating Teachers: A Pilot Study.
PUB DATE Nov 91
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association (Lexington, KY, November 13, 1991).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Attitude Measures; Comparative Analysis; *Cooperating Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation Utilization; *Extended Teacher Education Programs; Higher Education; Pilot Projects; Preservice Teacher Education; Rating Scales; *Student Teachers; Student Teacher Supervisors; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Interns
IDENTIFIERS Nation at Risk (A); Nation Prepared (A); University of Tennessee Knoxville

ABSTRACT

In 1987, in an effort to reform their preservice teacher education program, the University of Tennessee initiated a 5-year extended teacher training program. In contrast to traditional 4-year programs, future teachers begin their fifth year of professional study as interns after earning a baccalaureate degree in a subject area. This study was conducted to compare the teaching performance of the interns and the traditionally prepared student teachers. Participants in the study were cooperating teachers and 43 elementary and secondary teachers. The study utilized a survey instrument designed to examine cooperating teachers' perceptions of the teaching performance and effectiveness of their assigned student teachers in the traditional 4-year program and interns in the 5-year program. The questionnaire consisted of 24 items of an attitudinal nature and a two-part question concerning overall impressions of the cooperating teacher with respect to preparation of interns and student teachers. Findings suggest that there was no significant difference in ratings given to student teachers and interns. Three appendixes include a copy of the Intern/Student Teacher Questionnaire, a Question Responses Frequency Count, and Demographic Response Tabulations. (LL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED341658

INTERN/STUDENT TEACHERS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AS PERCEIVED BY THEIR COOPERATING TEACHERS: A PILOT STUDY

Submitted to the Mid-South Educational Research Association

November 13, 1991

by

Pete Jivelekas

Frieda Kalb Davis

Toby Rogers

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

T. W Rogers

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SP033543

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Introduction

Much media attention during the decade of the 1980s was focused on education in the United States. Criticism published by the National Commission on Excellence in Education in their 1983 report A Nation at Risk alarmed Americans, for it publicized the students' mediocre academic performance when ranked internationally. Americans who pride themselves on being first whenever possible found that not only were they never first, they were last in 7 out of 19 academic tests. Teacher preparation programs were criticized as being academically weak. The public demanded reform of the schools, stressing the need for accountability and competence in the teaching profession. A wave of educational reform in the second half of the decade focused on the preparation of teachers.

By 1985 a substantial number of five-year teacher training programs were established in the United States (Helmich, 1985). Many reports and studies published during the 1980s supported the extension of teacher preparation from four to five years. Prominent among them were Tomorrow's Teachers (Holmes Group, 1986) and A Nation Prepared (Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986).

In 1987 the University of Tennessee (UTK) initiated a five-year teacher training program that represented a significant change from the traditional four-year program. Like many of its counterparts, the University of Tennessee included a number of new elements in its extended program. Future teachers begin

their fifth year of professional study after earning a baccalaureate degree in their subject area. Interns are required to spend one full academic year working in a classroom setting, allowing them to witness the progress of classroom pupils over the course of the entire year. Interns are considered unpaid staff and are given a year's credit in the statewide school system. Interns are entirely responsible for planning, implementing and evaluating all aspects of instruction for selected classes. During the course of the year interns are expected to acquire experience in a number of teaching situations and develop their own teaching style while being supervised, observed and advised by the UTK staff and the mentoring teacher. Position papers (Travers, 1990; Holmes Group, 1986; Corcoran and Andrew, 1988) in support of the five year plan cite the following advantages to such a program:

1. It provides opportunity for extended professional growth in a supervised setting.
2. There is more contact between the school and the university.
3. The small group seminar becomes a support group for the intern.
4. There is a networking effect after working in a school setting for an extended period.
5. Students can develop more expertise in a content field.
6. Many five-year programs raise their admission standards, resulting in candidates with a high degree of proven

academic success.

Vocal opponents of the five-year teacher preparation plan (Hawley, 1987, 1988; Rhoades, 1987) raised the following objections:

1. There is a lack of research supporting the extended education plan.
2. Extended programs may actually decrease the pool of qualified candidates in teacher education.
3. Based on California's example, the status of teachers will not change.
4. Candidates will not learn more about teaching, since they will have fewer education courses.
5. The Holmes Group report is based on an English model of education and does not address problems the British have had in that system.

Related Research and Literature

Maureen W. McClure, John C. Weidman and Laure M. Sharp (1988) addressed the issue of what consequences the fifth year teacher preparation plan might have on the career paths of new teachers and on the personnel practices of school administrators. These researchers analyzed the career paths of college students who began teaching immediately after graduation. Was there a relationship between their compensation, their backgrounds, their

education and their work experience? Taking a secondary look at a longitudinal study which followed a sample of 1972 high school graduates, McClure, Weidman and Sharp concluded that the fifth year preparation program would be attractive only to those people who work in wealthier districts or those districts which favor advanced degrees. For the fifth year program to be advisable, school district hiring practices which follow the "least cost" philosophy would need to change. Their conclusions were based on a high correlation between the educational cost and background of the respondents and their dissatisfaction with their jobs. Also, humanities, liberal arts and social science majors were less satisfied with their teaching careers than education majors.

Ellen Corcoran and Michael Andrew (1988) from the University of New Hampshire (UNH) discussed the success of that school's thirteen year old fifth year program. They stated that University faculty and cooperating teachers were nearly unanimous in their approval of the program and they cited greater opportunity for professional growth, improved school-university relationships, support of small group seminars, and the networking of students into the schools after graduation. Follow-up studies conducted by UNH show that 92% of their graduates are placed in jobs the first year. This compares favorably with a 59% national average. The retention rate after ten years is also encouraging. The UNH program showed 74% of its graduates still in teaching, with a third of those not currently working planning to return. National surveys have indicated

retention figures ranging from 40% to 69%. In regard to job satisfaction 82% of UNH graduates say they would choose to teach again, while only 60% nationally would do so.

Andrew (1990) later completed a ten-year study of four and five year teacher education graduates within his own institution. His local study confirmed many of the findings in the previously cited national study. His study indicated that five-year program interns had higher job longevity rates, greater career satisfaction, a more favorable view of teaching peers and a more positive attitude about the teaching environment than did their counterparts in the four-year program.

Because of the political ramifications of the teacher education debate, two Ohio researchers conducted a survey of education professionals and pre-professionals and asked them what they thought of five-year programs. Frederick Cyphert and Kevin Ryan (1988) found a generally negative attitude toward five year programs in both groups. If five year programs had been mandatory, 60% of both groups would not have chosen to enter the teaching profession. However, 90% of both groups would enter the program if it included a masters's degree.

Roseanne Blass and Jeffrey Dunbar (1986) described the Allegheny College Extended Teacher Education Program as combining the four-year and five-year models by requiring undergraduate preparation and student teaching as well as a fifth year internship and graduate study. Students are certified by the fall of the fifth year and must secure a regular teaching

position in the Greater Cleveland metropolitan area school system. Follow-up studies in 1978 and 1982 provided information on graduates of the program from 1977 to 1981. Classroom performance was rated from above average to outstanding.

There are a variety of five-year program designs and opinions as to their practical effectiveness. As legislators and educators debate the merits of teacher preparation programs, conflicting viewpoints and research needs to be considered.

Methodology

Since cooperating teachers spend more supervisory time with the interns/student teachers than did the officials of the university, the research indicated that their performance ratings for the two groups would yield valuable data to the on-going debate concerning teacher preparation. Also, by analyzing the results and by determining where the strengths and weaknesses of each group lay, we hoped to provide information useful to officials planning and evaluating the teacher preparation program at UTK.

Our null hypothesis was that there would be no significant difference between the teaching performance of the interns and the teaching performance of the student teachers. The alternate hypothesis was that there would be a significant difference between the teaching performance of the interns and the teaching

performance of the student teachers.

The population of the survey consisted of the entire population of cooperating teachers who had supervised both UTK interns and student teachers. For purposes of the study cooperating teachers must have supervised their most recent student teacher no longer than seven years ago. Forty-three elementary and secondary teachers were obtained from a database search supplied by the UTK College of Education Office of Field Studies. Student teachers and interns under cooperating teachers' supervision were to have been trained only in the four and five-year programs at UTK. The cooperating teachers were to base their responses on their most recent student teacher and most recent intern.

This study utilized a survey instrument designed to examine cooperating teachers' perceptions of the teaching performance and effectiveness of their assigned student teachers in the traditional four-year program and interns in the five-year program.

The questionnaire consisted of 24 items of an attitudinal nature (see Appendix A). The instrument was developed by the researchers using a wide variety of evaluation models as guides (Tennessee, 1984; Blass and Dunbar, 1986; Carfield and James, 1984; Beach, 1984; Cangelosi, 1984) as well as the study done at the University of New Hampshire (Andrew, 1990). The 24 questions were grouped into five areas: instructional strategies and planning, knowledge of the content area, classroom management,

evaluation techniques, and professionalism. Valuable insight and suggestions were incorporated from selected professors and educational administrators at UTK. A Likert scale was used, proceeding from "5" to "1" and included an "NA" (not applicable) response (see Appendix A). The value label "5" represented behavior which was perceived to have been observed "all of the time" and the value label "1" represented perception of behavior which was "never" observed. Identical answers were made in two columns: one for interns and the other for student teachers.

The survey also included a two-part question concerning the overall impressions of the cooperating teacher regarding the preparation of their most recent intern and student teacher. In the first part, cooperating teachers gave a Likert scale response. There were five value ratings to choose from ranging from "Intern was substantially better prepared than student teacher" to "Intern was substantially not as well prepared as student teacher." Part two was open ended and asked for a basis for the cooperating teachers' responses to part one (See Appendix A).

The instrument was mailed along with a cover letter that explained the need for this information and encouraged participation. The completed instrument was to be returned in a self-addressed, stamped envelope. The instruments were coded for follow-up purposes and confidentiality assurances were made. The return rate was 77% (33 of 43 returned). This result was attained with one follow-up of non-respondents seven working days

after the original mailing. Responses were tabulated into frequency distributions (See Appendices B and C). Of the 33 respondents, seven were taken out of the study because half or more of the questions were unanswered. This left a total of 28 completed questionnaires.

Frequency variables for the twenty-eight remaining questionnaires were used to obtain percent, mean, and standard deviation scores for interns or student teachers for each of the twenty-four questions and for the total in each category. They were also used to obtain a mean and a standard deviation figure for the overall question in part six (Appendix A). A paired samples t-test was conducted on the mean scores of the two groups in each category. Test results from each category were compared to the gender of the intern/student teacher, the age of the intern/student teacher, the age of the cooperating teacher, the degree of the cooperating teacher, and the length of time since the student teacher was supervised.

A Chi-Square test was done for each question, the totals of each category and the overall question for each intern/student teacher group. This was used to determine goodness of fit or for determining if what was observed differed from what could be expected by chance at the five percent level of significance. A Two-Way Chi-Square for two independent samples was also done on each question, the totals of each category and the overall question. This test determined whether differences exist between performance ratings and the two groups of interns and student

teachers at the five percent level of significance. These calculations produced null results. In order to avoid distortion responses were collapsed into two cells combining the response cell "all of the time" with the response cell "most of the time" and one combining the generally smaller response cells "some of the time", "seldom" and "never".

Limitations

There were many apparent limitations to this study. The teacher's ratings were retrospective, with the elapsed time varying considerably (some responses relied on a most recent student teacher supervised over five years from the date of the questionnaire). The student teacher was supervised further in the past than was the intern, which could cause a distortion of objective responses.

Standards of admission to the programs in the College of Education at UTK have risen since student teachers were observed. These changing standards may affect the areas measured by their cooperating teachers.

It was assumed that most cooperating teachers would have been personally educated in a student teacher setting, and be somewhat biased either for or against that system.

Interns were in the school longer, allowing more time for strengths or weaknesses to emerge. Interns were expected to take on more responsibility for planning and instruction and could

bring in their own ideas more readily than could a student teacher who was in the school for markedly less time.

Some concern was voiced by principals that the heavy course load carried by interns affected adversely the quality of their performance in the schools. Several written comments to this effect were made on the questionnaire by cooperating teachers. Several respondents also commented that personality differences between individuals was the most significant factor in shaping their responses.

The lack of qualitative methodology in this survey limited insights to those connected to quantitative research.

Findings

Of the 33 respondents, seven were taken out of the study because half or more of the questions remained unanswered. This left a total of 28 completed questionnaires. The total responses to the 28 questionnaires were tabulated (see Appendices B and C). Mean scores by question groupings and the mean for all questions is shown on Table 1 (also see Appendix B). T-tests revealed no significant differences between the means of the individual, grouped, or total responses.

Percentage and frequency of response to the overall preparedness of the student teacher or intern is shown on Table 2 (also see Appendix B). Forty-three percent of the respondents

stated that the intern was better or substantially better prepared than the student teacher. Thirty-two percent stated that the intern was either not as well or substantially not as well prepared as the student teacher. Twenty-four percent of the respondents perceived no difference between the preparation of the intern and student teacher.

In the second part of the overall question, many respondents produced written reasons for their perceptions. These are summarized and produced in Table 3.

Table 1

Mean Scores by Question Groupings
(on a scale of 1 to 5 with 5 as highest)

	Interns	Student Teachers
I. INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES AND PLANNING . .	3.68	3.93
II. KNOWLEDGE OF CONTENT AREA	3.84	4.01
III. CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT	3.81	3.96
IV. EVALUATION TECHNIQUES	3.88	3.95
V. PROFESSIONALISM	3.23	3.41
Total for 24 questions	**3.69**	**3.85**

Table 2

Question: "The overall preparedness of intern as compared to student teacher was . . ."

	Frequency		Percentage
substantially better	4	=	14%
better	8	=	29%
same	7	=	25%
not as well	5	=	18%
substantially not as well	4	=	12%

Table 3

Comments by Cooperating Teachers

Intern *	
Comments	Frequency
Well or better prepared than student teachers	15
More maturity than student teachers	4
Too many university classes to perform internship duties adequately	4
Lacked an adequate teaching strategy	4
A lack of interest in intern-related tasks	3
A high interest level in intern-related tasks	3
Able to handle responsibility	1
Good Student Rapport	1
Regrets that intern was unpaid	1

Student Teacher *	
Comments	Frequency
Well or better prepared than intern	8
Lacked skills	2
Frightened	2
More enthusiastic than intern	2
Buddy to students	1

* Note that there were eight (8) cooperating teachers that stated: "No or little difference in intern or student teacher preparation".

Tables 4 and 5 show how the degree and teaching experience of cooperating teachers were related to their responses to questions on overall preparedness.

Tables 6 and 7 show the relations of the ages of the interns and student teachers to the responses on overall preparedness. Finally, Tables 8 and 9 show the gender of interns and student teachers in conjunction with the overall preparedness response.

Table 4.

RESPONSE BY DEGREE HELD OF COOPERATING TEACHER TO THE STATEMENT:

"THE OVERALL PREPAREDNESS OF INTERN AS COMPARED TO THE STUDENT TEACHER WAS . . ."

	Substantially better	Better	The same	Not as well	Substantially not as well	Total
B.S	4 (31%)	3 (23%)	3 (23%)	1 (8%)	2 (15%)	13
M.S./ Ed.S	1 (7%)	5 (33%)	4 (27%)	4 (27%)	1 (7%)	15
Total	5 (18%)	8 (29%)	7 (25%)	5 (18%)	3 (11%)	28

Table 5.

RESPONSE BY TEACHING EXPERIENCE OF COOPERATING TEACHER TO THE STATEMENT:

"THE OVERALL PREPAREDNESS OF INTERN AS COMPARED TO THE STUDENT TEACHER WAS . . ."

COOP-YEARS	Substantially better	Better	The same	Not as well	Substantially not as well	Total
1-10	2 (40%)	3 (60%)	0	0	0	5
11+	2 (9%)	5 (22%)	7 (30%)	5 (22%)	4 (17%)	23
Total	4 (14%)	8 (29%)	7 (25%)	5 (18%)	4 (14%)	28

Table 6.

RESPONSE BY AGE OF INTERN TO THE STATEMENT:

"THE OVERALL PREPAREDNESS OF INTERN AS COMPARED TO THE STUDENT TEACHER WAS . . ."

INTERN AGES	Substantially better	Better	The same	Not as well	Substantially not as well	Total
20-25	1 (8%)	4 (31%)	4 (31%)	4 (31%)	0	13
26-35	2 (20%)	3 (20%)	3 (30%)	1 (10%)	2 (20%)	10
36+	1 (20%)	1 (20%)	1 (20%)	1 (20%)	1 (20%)	5
TOTAL	4 (14%)	7 (25%)	8 (29%)	6 (21%)	3 (11%)	28

Table 7.

RESPONSE BY AGE OF STUDENT TEACHER TO THE STATEMENT:

"THE OVERALL PREPAREDNESS OF INTERN AS COMPARED TO THE STUDENT TEACHER WAS . . ."

S.T. AGES	Substantially better	Better	The same	Not as well	Substantially not as well	Total
20-25	1 (6%)	6 (38%)	2 (13%)	3 (19%)	4 (25%)	16
26-35	2 (25%)	2 (25%)	2 (25%)	2 (25%)	0	8
36+	2 (50%)	0	2 (50%)	0	0	4
Total	5 (18%)	8 (29%)	6 (21%)	5 (18%)	4 (14%)	28

Table 8.

RESPONSE BY GENDER OF INTERN TO THE STATEMENT:

"THE OVERALL PREPAREDNESS OF INTERN AS COMPARED TO THE STUDENT TEACHER WAS . . ."

INTERN	Substantially better	Better	The same	Not as well	Substantially not as well	Total
MALE	1 (10%)	1 (10%)	3 (30%)	3 (30%)	2 (20%)	10
FEMALE	2 (13%)	5 (31%)	5 (31%)	2 (13%)	2 (13%)	16
Total	3 (12%)	6 (23%)	8 (31%)	5 (19%)	4 (15%)	26

Note- 2 respondents did not fill out this item

Table 9.

RESPONSE BY GENDER OF STUDENT TEACHER TO THE STATEMENT:

"THE OVERALL PREPAREDNESS OF INTERN AS COMPARED TO THE STUDENT TEACHER WAS . . ."

S.T.	Substantially better	Better	The same	Not as well	Substantially not as well	Total
MALE	1 (50%)	0	1 (50%)	0	0	2
FEMALE	2 (8%)	7 (29%)	6 (25%)	5 (21%)	4 (17%)	24
Total	3 (12%)	7 (27%)	7 (27%)	5 (19%)	4 (15%)	26

Note- 2 respondents did not fill out this item.

CONCLUSIONS

It was hoped that some description of differences between interns and student teacher preparation could be analyzed and reported through this survey. Overall, there was no significant difference in the ratings given to student teachers and interns.

Other conclusions are drawn from the findings:

1) The teaching experience of cooperating teachers appears to contribute to their perceptions of teacher preparation (seventy-five percent of cooperating teachers with 1 - 10 years experience favored the intern over the student teacher while only thirty-six percent of cooperating teachers with 11+ years experience did so).

2) Female interns and student teachers were rated consistently better prepared than their male counterparts by the cooperating teachers. Ninety-four percent of the cooperating teachers were female.

3) The twenty-four questions' average mean score for the student teachers was slightly higher than the interns while the Table 2 (overall comparison question) showed a forty-five percent favorable for interns and a thirty percent favorable for student teachers. This was possibly due to the relatively low numbers (thirty-three) used in this research.

This survey might be replicated in 1994, when all student interns would have completed the five-year program after having applied for admission at the entry-level.

References

Andrew, Michael D. (1990). Differences between graduates of 4-year and 5-year teacher preparation programs. Journal of Education, 41(2), 45-51.

Beach, Don M. and Judy Reinhartz (1984). Using criteria of effective teaching to judge teacher performance. NASSP Bulletin, 68 (Nov.), 31-37.

Blass, Rosanne J. and Jeffrey Dunbar (1986). Teacher education reform at Allegheny College. Educational Horizons, 64, 87-89.

Carfield, Rebecca and James Walter (1984). Teacher evaluation and RIF- Can there be peaceful coexistence? NASSP Bulletin, 68 (Nov.), 48-53.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. (1986). A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century (The Report of the Task Force on Teaching as a Profession). New York, New York: Author.

Clark, Richard J. and John C. Fischer (1987). Candidate selection in a fifth year teacher education recruitment model: A multi-stage partnership approach. Journal of Teacher Education, 38, 26-30.

Congelosi, James (1984). Evaluating teaching: A suggestion for principals. NASSP Bulletin, 68 (Nov.), 19-23.

Corcoran, Ellen and Michael Andrew (1988). A full year internship: An example of school-university collaboration. Journal of Teacher Education, 39, 17-22.

Cruickshank, Donald R. and Josue Cruz, Jr. (1989). Trends in teacher preparation. Journal of Teacher Education, 40, 49-56.

Cyphert, Frederick R. "Ted" and Kevin A. Ryan. (1988). Extending initial teacher preparation: Some issues and answers. Action in Teacher Education, 9, 111-118.

Dill, Vicky S. (1990). Support for the 'unsupportable'. Phi Delta Kappan, 72, 198-199.

Denner, Barbara W. and Susan Kirchhoff (1989). The Gahanna-Jefferson City Internship Program. Phi Delta Kappan, 71, 166-167.

Eubanks, Eugene E. and Ralph I Parish (1990). Why Does the Status Quo Persist? Phi Delta Kappan, 72, 196-197.

Gideonse, Hendrik D. (1987). Which Way to Millinocket? American Journal of Education, 95, 309-313.

Gifford, Bernard (1987). A Commentary on Hawley. American Journal of Education, 95, 304-307.

Goodlad, John I. (1990). Better Teachers for Our Nations Schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 72, 185-194.

Hawk, Parmalee P. and Mary W. Schmidt (1989). Teacher preparation: A comparison of traditional and alternative programs. Journal of Teacher Education, 40, 53-58.

Hawley, Willis D. (1987). A response to critics. American Journal of Education, 95, 487-491.

Hawley, Willis D. (1988). Improving teacher education without five-year programs. Educational Digest, 53, 36-39.

Hawley, Willis D. (1987). The high costs and doubtful efficacy of extended teacher-preparation programs: An invitation to more basic reforms. American Journal of Education, 95, 275-297.

Hegler, Kay L. and George A. Antonelli (1988). The education warranty: Certifying teacher competence. Phi Kappa Phi Journal, 68, 45-46.

Helmich, Edith (1985). An Overview of Fifth-Year Teacher Education Programs (Report No. SP-027-363). Springfield, IL: Illinois State Board of Education, Dept. of Planning, Research and Evaluation. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 182 465)

Johnson, Tony W. (1990). Taking a first step toward reform. Phi Delta Kappan, 72, 202-203.

Joseph, Ellis A. (1989). The perfectibility of means and the disregard of ends. Journal of Teacher Education, 40, 18-21.

Joyce, Bruce R. (1988). Training research and preservice teacher education: A reconsideration. Journal of Teacher Education, 39, 32-36.

McClure, Maureen W., John C. Weidman and Laure M. Sharp (1988). Teaching Career Paths and Teacher Education Reforms. Educational Administration Quarterly, 24(2), 200-221.

Morsink, Catherine V. (1988). Preparing teachers as

collaborators in special education. The Clearing House, 61, 317-319.

Nagel, Nancy (1988). One university's response to teacher education reform. Educational Leadership, 46, 23-24.

Rhoades, Gary (1987). In pursuit of whose excellence? American Journal of Education, 95, 299-303.

Roth, Robert A. (1989). The teacher education program: An endangered species? Phi Delta Kappan, 71, 319-323.

Sikula, John (1990). National Commission Reports of the 1980's. In W. Robert Houston, Handbook of Research on Teacher Education, (pp. 72-81). New York: Macmillian Co.

Sikula, John (Chair). (1986). Visions of Reform: Implications for the Education Profession The Report of the ATE Blue Ribbon Task Force. Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Tennessee, State of (1984). Tennessee Instructional Model-Staff Development Working Draft. Nashville: Tennessee Department of Education.

Travers, Paul D. (1990). A five year teacher education program: An old idea. Education, 111(2), 222-225.

The Holmes Group. (1986). Tomarrow's Teachers. East Lansing, Michigan: The Holmes Group, Inc.

Wisniewski, Richard (1988). Illinois Smith and the Secret of the Knowledge Base. Journal of Teacher Education, 39, 2-4.

Wisniewski, Richard (1990). Let's Get On With It. Phi Delta Kappan, 72, 195-196.

Intern/Student Teacher Questionnaire

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

On the items below, circle the number which best reflects your perceptions: 5 (all of the time), 4 (most of the time), 3 (some of the time), 2 (seldom), or 1 (never). If an item is not appropriate or wasn't observable, circle NA. Mark each question on behalf of the most recent intern (shaded scale) and your most recent student teacher (unshaded scale). Your evaluation should reflect your perceptions of the student's performance toward the end of their experience.

I. INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES AND PLANNING	INTERN ○ ◎	STUDENT TEACHER ○ ◎
1. Planned for daily lessons in an organized and timely fashion	5 4 3 2 1 NA	5 4 3 2 1 NA
2. Planned lessons which were academically effective	5 4 3 2 1 NA	5 4 3 2 1 NA
3. Identified academic entry level of students	5 4 3 2 1 NA	5 4 3 2 1 NA
4. Created a relationship between daily lessons and long-range goals	5 4 3 2 1 NA	5 4 3 2 1 NA
5. Used a teaching approach(es) appropriate to student learning capabilities	5 4 3 2 1 NA	5 4 3 2 1 NA
6. Used clear, precise language in presenting ideas	5 4 3 2 1 NA	5 4 3 2 1 NA

II. KNOWLEDGE OF CONTENT AREA	INTERN ○ ◎	STUDENT TEACHER ○ ◎
1. Demonstrated a factual knowledge of content area(s)	5 4 3 2 1 NA	5 4 3 2 1 NA
2. Demonstrated conceptual knowledge of content area(s)	5 4 3 2 1 NA	5 4 3 2 1 NA
3. Demonstrated an ability to integrate related disciplines to the content area	5 4 3 2 1 NA	5 4 3 2 1 NA
4. Demonstrated an ability to illustrate practical applications of the content area	5 4 3 2 1 NA	5 4 3 2 1 NA
5. Displayed a willingness to use appropriate resources in addition to the text	5 4 3 2 1 NA	5 4 3 2 1 NA

III. CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT	INTERN ○ ◎	STUDENT TEACHER ○ ◎
1. Communicated expected classroom behavior to students	5 4 3 2 1 NA	5 4 3 2 1 NA
2. Established a consistent structure of consequences for student behavior	5 4 3 2 1 NA	5 4 3 2 1 NA
3. Maintained good rapport with students	5 4 3 2 1 NA	5 4 3 2 1 NA
4. Organized materials effectively	5 4 3 2 1 NA	5 4 3 2 1 NA

IV. EVALUATION TECHNIQUES	INTERN ○ ◎	STUDENT TEACHER ○ ◎
1. Evaluated student achievement on a continual basis	5 4 3 2 1 NA	5 4 3 2 1 NA
2. Implemented an evaluation strategy that was fair to all students	5 4 3 2 1 NA	5 4 3 2 1 NA
3. Supplied students with appropriate feedback	5 4 3 2 1 NA	5 4 3 2 1 NA
4. Evaluated their own teaching strategies	5 4 3 2 1 NA	5 4 3 2 1 NA

Please turn over and complete the other side --->

V PROFESSIONALISM	INTERN ☺ ☹	STUDENT TEACHER ☺ ☹
1 Exhibited a good working relationship with teaching colleagues.	5 4 3 2 1 NA	5 4 3 2 1 NA
2 Demonstrated an ability to communicate tactfully.	5 4 3 2 1 NA	5 4 3 2 1 NA
3 Illustrated an acquaintance with current trends in instructional improvements.	5 4 3 2 1 NA	5 4 3 2 1 NA
4 Volunteered to participate in extracurricular activities.	5 4 3 2 1 NA	5 4 3 2 1 NA
5 Represented a positive role model for students.	5 4 3 2 1 NA	5 4 3 2 1 NA

VI OVERALL

In your opinion, how did your most recent intern's overall preparation for the teaching profession compare with your most recent student teacher (check the box of the appropriate response).

1 ☐ Intern was substantially better prepared than student teacher. ☐ Intern was better prepared than student teacher. ☐ The Same ☐ Intern not as well prepared as student teacher. ☐ Intern was substantially not as well prepared as student teacher.

2 Briefly list your reasons for giving the above response _____

_____

_____

VII General Information about Cooperating Teacher (please check one box for each section)

Gender: ☐ Female ☐ Male

Highest Degree Attained:
- ☐ Less than Bachelors degree
- ☐ Bachelors degree
- ☐ Masters degree
- ☐ Ed S
- ☐ Doctorate

Years of Teaching Experience:
- ☐ 1 - 5 years
- ☐ 6 - 10 years
- ☐ 11 - 15 years
- ☐ 16 + years

VIII General Information about Intern/Student Teacher (please check one box for each section)

Gender: (Intern) ☐ Male ☐ Female
(Student Teacher) ☐ Male ☐ Female

Age: (Intern) ☐ 20 - 25 ☐ 26 - 35 ☐ 36+
(Student Teacher) ☐ 20 - 25 ☐ 26 - 35 ☐ 36+

Subject Area(s): (Intern)_____

(Student Teacher)

When did you supervise your most recent **STUDENT TEACHER**:

☐ 1 - 3 years ago ☐ 4 - 7 years ago ☐ 8 or more years ago

Please return this completed survey in the supplied self-addressed envelope. We appreciate your assistance. Please return this form to:

Attn: Dr. John Ray
University of Tennessee
College of Education
312 Claxton Education Building
Knoxville, TN 37996-3400

Appendix B

Likert Scale Question Responses
Frequency Count

Part 1
Instructional
Strategies and
Planning

	INTERN						STUDENT TEACHER					
Rating →	5	4	3	2	1	NA	5	4	3	2	1	NA
1.	12	9	2	4	0	1	10	12	3	2	0	1
2.	4	15	6	1	1	1	4	18	4	1	0	1
3.	3	9	8	3	2	3	5	8	9	2	0	4
4.	3	17	5	1	1	1	4	16	6	1	0	1
5.	4	16	6	1	1	0	4	17	6	0	1	0
6.	9	12	4	1	1	1	10	12	5	0	0	1
Total →	35	78	31	11	6	7	37	83	33	6	1	8

Intern Mean Response= 3.68 Student Teacher Mean Response=3.93

Part 2
Knowledge of
Content Area

	INTERN						STUDENT TEACHER					
Rating →	5	4	3	2	1	NA	5	4	3	2	1	NA
1.	8	14	4	0	1	1	10	12	5	0	0	1
2.	6	15	5	0	1	1	7	15	5	0	0	1
3.	5	9	9	2	1	2	2	15	5	0	0	1
4.	5	13	8	1	1	0	8	10	8	1	0	1
5.	12	8	5	1	2	0	11	7	9	1	0	0
Total →	36	59	31	4	6	4	38	59	35	3	0	5

Intern Mean Response=3.84 Student Teacher Mean Response=4.01

Part 3
Classroom
Management

	INTERN						STUDENT TEACHER					
Rating →	5	4	3	2	1	NA	5	4	3	2	1	NA
1.	5	16	4	2	1	0	6	14	7	1	0	0
2.	5	10	9	2	2	0	6	10	10	2	0	0
3.	11	11	4	0	2	0	9	17	2	0	0	0
4.	9	9	7	1	1	1	8	13	5	1	0	1
Total →	30	46	24	5	6	1	29	54	24	4	0	1

Intern Mean Response=3.81 Student Teacher Mean Response=3.96

Part 4
Evaluation
Techniques

	INTERN						STUDENT TEACHER					
Rating →	5	4	3	2	1	NA	5	4	3	2	1	NA
1.	7	15	3	1	1	1	8	12	6	1	0	1
2.	7	14	5	0	1	1	10	12	3	2	0	1
3.	7	14	5	0	0	1	7	15	5	1	0	0
4.	6	11	8	1	2	0	4	11	13	0	0	0
Total →	27	54	21	3	5	2	29	50	27	4	0	2

Intern Mean Response=3.88 Student Teacher Mean Response=3.95

Part 5
Professionalism

	INTERN						STUDENT TEACHER					
Rating →	5	4	3	2	1	NA	5	4	3	2	1	NA
1.	12	11	3	0	2	0	12	14	2	0	0	0
2.	12	10	4	0	2	0	13	11	4	0	0	0
3.	7	10	8	1	1	1	6	10	11	0	0	1
4.	7	7	5	3	6	0	4	13	4	4	3	0
5.	7	7	5	3	6	0	4	13	4	4	3	0
6.	17	6	3	1	1	0	13	13	2	0	0	0
Total →	55	44	23	5	12	1	48	61	23	4	3	1

Intern Mean Response=3.23 Student Teacher Mean Response=3.41

Intern Mean Response for All Questions=3.69
Student Teacher Mean Response for All Questions=3.85

Part 6 Overall
Part 1

	Respondents
Substantially Better-	**4**
Better-	**8**
Same-	**7**
Not As Well-	**5**
Substantially Not As Well-	**4**

Demographic Response Tabulations

Part 7
General Information
about Cooperating
Teacher

Gender

	RESPONDENTS
MALE-	2
FEMALE-	26

Highest Degree Attained

LESS THAN B.A.-	0
BACHELORS-	12
MASTERS-	14
Ed. S.-	1
DOCTORATE-	0

Years of Teaching Experience

1-5 YEARS-	1
6-10 YEARS-	3
11-15 YEARS-	9
16+ YEARS-	15

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE

Appendix C
(cont.)

Note- Respondents did not answer all items.

Part 8
General Information
about Intern/Student Teacher

Gender of Intern	RESPONDENTS
MALE-	10
FEMALE-	16
Gender of Student Teacher	
MALE-	2
FEMALE-	23
Age of Interns	
20-25 YEARS-	12
26-35 YEARS-	10
36+ YEARS-	5
Age of Student Teachers	
20-25 YEARS-	17
26-35 YEARS-	7
36+ YEARS-	2

Question: When did you supervise your most recent STUDENT TEACHER:

1-3 YEARS AGO-	22
4-7 YEARS AGO-	6
8 OR MORE YEARS AGO-	0